## OHIO PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION

65 East State Street, Suite 312 Columbus, Ohio 43215 (614) 466-0880

### APPLICATION FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Revised 6/90

1	B	$\wedge$	/
	رح		4

IMPORTANT: Applicant should consult the "Instructions for Completion of Project Application for assistance in the proper completion of this form.

APPLICANT NAME	Delhi Township Board of Trustees
STREET	934 Neeb Road
CITY/ZIP	Cincinnati, Ohio 45233
•	
PROJECT NAME	Briarhill / Anders Reconstruction
PROJECT TYPE	Reconstruction
TOTAL COST	\$ 320,496.50
TOTAL COST .	9 320,490.50
DICTRICT AUGUSTED	
DISTRICT NUMBER	2
COUNTY	Hamilton
•	
	ZIP CODE 45238
PROJECT LOCATION	
PROJECT LOCATION	
	ICT FUNDING RECOMMENDATION
DISTR	
DISTR	ICT FUNDING RECOMMENDATION
DISTR	ICT FUNDING RECOMMENDATION pleted by the District Committee ONLY
DISTR To be comp RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	ICT FUNDING RECOMMENDATION pleted by the District Committee ONLY  OF FUNDING: \$ 288,447.00
DISTR To be comp RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	ICT FUNDING RECOMMENDATION pleted by the District Committee ONLY  OF FUNDING: \$ 288,447.00
DISTR To be comp RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	ICT FUNDING RECOMMENDATION pleted by the District Committee ONLY
DISTR To be comp RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	ICT FUNDING RECOMMENDATION pleted by the District Committee ONLY  OF FUNDING: \$ 288,447.00  ING SOURCE (Check Only One):  on State Issue 2 Small Government Fund
DISTR To be comp  RECOMMENDED AMOUNT  FUND  State Issue 2 District Allocation  Grant	ICT FUNDING RECOMMENDATION pleted by the District Committee ONLY  OF FUNDING: \$ 288,447.00  ING SOURCE (Check Only One):  on State Issue 2 Small Government Fund State Issue 2 Emergency Funds
DISTR To be comp  RECOMMENDED AMOUNT  FUND  State Issue 2 District Allocation  Grant Loan	ICT FUNDING RECOMMENDATION pleted by the District Committee ONLY  OF FUNDING: \$ 288,447.00  ING SOURCE (Check Only One):
DISTR To be comp  RECOMMENDED AMOUNT  FUND  State Issue 2 District Allocation  Grant	ICT FUNDING RECOMMENDATION pleted by the District Committee ONLY  OF FUNDING: \$ 288,447.00  ING SOURCE (Check Only One):  on State Issue 2 Small Government Fund State Issue 2 Emergency Funds
DISTR To be comp  RECOMMENDED AMOUNT  FUND  State Issue 2 District Allocation  Grant Loan	ICT FUNDING RECOMMENDATION pleted by the District Committee ONLY  OF FUNDING: \$ 288,447.00  ING SOURCE (Check Only One):  on State Issue 2 Small Government Fund State Issue 2 Emergency Funds
DISTR To be comp  RECOMMENDED AMOUNT  FUND  State Issue 2 District Allocation  Grant Loan	ICT FUNDING RECOMMENDATION pleted by the District Committee ONLY  OF FUNDING: \$ 288,447.00  ING SOURCE (Check Only One):  on State Issue 2 Small Government Fund State Issue 2 Emergency Funds
DISTR To be comp  RECOMMENDED AMOUNT  FUND  State Issue 2 District Allocation  Grant Loan	ICT FUNDING RECOMMENDATION pleted by the District Committee ONLY  OF FUNDING: \$ 288,447.00  ING SOURCE (Check Only One):  on State Issue 2 Small Government Fund State Issue 2 Emergency Funds X Local Transportation Improvement Fund
DISTR To be comp  RECOMMENDED AMOUNT  FUND  State Issue 2 District Allocation  Grant Loan Loan Assistance	ICT FUNDING RECOMMENDATION pleted by the District Committee ONLY  OF FUNDING: \$ 288,447.00  ING SOURCE (Check Only One):  on State Issue 2 Small Government Fund State Issue 2 Emergency Funds X Local Transportation Improvement Fund  FOR OPWC USE ONLY
DISTR To be comp  RECOMMENDED AMOUNT  FUND  State Issue 2 District Allocation  Grant Loan Loan Assistance	ICT FUNDING RECOMMENDATION pleted by the District Committee ONLY  OF FUNDING: \$ 288,447.00  ING SOURCE (Check Only One):  on State Issue 2 Small Government Fund State Issue 2 Emergency Funds X Local Transportation Improvement Fund

## 1.0 APPLICANT INFORMATION

1.1	CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER TITLE STREET CITY/ZIP PHONE FAX	Hal L. Franke Board President 934 Neeb Road  Cincinnati, Ohio 45233 ( 513 ) 922 - 3111 ( 513 ) 922 - 9315
1.2	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TITLE STREET	Robert A. Bedinghaus Township Clerk 934 Neeb Road
	CITY/ZIP PHONE FAX	Cincinnati, Ohio 45233 ( 513 ) 922 - 3111 ( 513 ) 922 - 9315
1.3	PROJECT MGR TITLE STREET	Robert W. Bass Highway Superintendent 665 Neeb Road
	CITY/ZIP PHONE FAX	Cincinnati, Ohio 45233 ( 513 ) 922 - 8609 ( 513 ) 922 - 8635
1.4	PROJECT CONTACT TITLE STREET	Robert W. Bass Project Manager 665 Neeb Road
	CITY/ZIP PHONE FAX	Cincinnati, Ohio 45233 ( 513 ) 922 - 8609 ( 513 ) 922 - 8635
1.5	DISTRICT LIAISON TITLE STREET	William Brayshaw, P.E., P.S.  Chief Deputy Engineer  138 E. Court Street, Room 700
	CITY/ZIP PHONE FAX	Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  ( 513 ) 632 - 8691 ( 513 ) 723 - 9748

### 2.0 PROJECT INFORMATION

IMPORTANT: If project is multi-jurisdictional in nature, information must be <u>consolidated</u> for completion of this section.

- 2.1 PROJECT NAME: Briarhill / Anders Reconstruction
- 2.2 BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION (Sections A through D):
  A. SPECIFIC LOCATION:

Project is located in south central Delhi Township. Township population is approximately 30,000. ADT equals 442 (see attached "Pavement Management Section Survey").

#### B. PROJECT COMPONENTS:

Full depth removal of existing pavement. Subgrade stabilization and curb underdrains. New concrete curbs and full depth pavement replacement at 8 inch depth. Rehabilitation of current drainage system and replacement of deteriorated sidewalk.

### C. PHYSICAL DIMENSIONS/CHARACTERISTICS:

Streets are approximately 35 years old. Pavements are in poor condition with standing water on roadway. Current overlays only mask severe subgrade problems. Full and partial depth repairs not performed.

#### D. DESIGN SERVICE CAPACITY:

IMPORTANT: Detail shall be included regarding current service capacity vs proposed service level. If road or bridge project, include ADT. If water or wastewater project include current residential rates based on monthly usage of 7,756 gallons pe household.

Design is for maximum service due to the extensive work being done on the subgrade, the drainage system, the new curb and gutter and the new pavement.

## 2.3 REQUIRED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

(Photographs/Additional Description; Capital Improvements Report; Priority List 5-year Plan; 2-year Maintenance of Effort report, etc.) Also discuss the numbe of temporary and/or fulltime jobs which are likely to be created as a result of this project. Attach Pages. Refer to accompanying instructions for furthe detail.

### 3.0 PROJECT FINANCIAL INFORMATION

#### 3.1 **PROJECT ESTIMATED COSTS** (Round to Nearest Dollar):

a)	Project Engineering Costs:  1. Preliminary Engineering	\$_	N/A
	2. Final Design	\$_	N/A
	3. Construction Supervision	\$	N/A
b)	Acquisition Expenses  1. Land	¢	N/A
	2. Right-of-Way	\$ \$	N/A
c)	Construction Costs	\$_	303,221.50
ď)	Equipment Costs	\$_	
e)	Other Direct Expenses	\$_	
Ð	Contingencies .	\$_	17,275.00
a)	TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS	\$	320,496.50

#### 3.2 PROJECT FINANCIAL RESOURCES (Round to Nearest Dollar and Percent)

	•		Dollars	%
a)	Local In-Kind Contributions	\$	0	_
b)	Local Public Revenues	\$_	32,049.65	10
c)	Local Private Revenues	\$_	0	
d)	Other Public Revenues			
	1. ODOT	\$	0	
	2. FMHA	\$_	0	_
	3. OEPA	\$_	0	
	4. OWDA	\$_	0	
	5. CDBG	\$	0	
	6. Other	\$_	0	
e)	OPWC Funds			
	1. Grant	\$_	288,446.85	90
	2. Loan	\$	0	
•	<ol><li>Loan Assistance</li></ol>	\$_	0	-
Ð	TOTAL FINANCIAL RESOURCES	\$_	320,496.50	100

If the required local match is to be 100% In-Kind Contributions, list source of funds to be used for retainage purposes:

### 3.3 AVAILABILITY OF LOCAL FUNDS

Indicate the status of <u>all</u> local share funding sources listed in section 3.2(a) through 3.4(c). In addition, if funds are coming from sources listed in section 3.2(d), the following information <u>must be attached to this project application</u>:

- 1) The date funds are available;
- 2) Verification of funds in the form of an agency approval letter or agency project number. Please include the name and number of the agency contact person.

### 3.4 PREPAID ITEMS Definitions: Cost -Total Cost of the Prepaid Item. Non-construction costs, including preliminary engineering, final Cost Item design, acquisition expenses (land or right-of-way). Cost Items (non-construction costs directly related to the project), Prepaid paid prior to receipt of fully executed Project Agreement from OPWC. Resource Calegory -Source of funds (see section 3.2). Invoice(s) and copies of warrant(s) used to for prepaid costs, accompanied by Project Manager's Certification (see section 1.4). Verification -IMPORTANT: Verification of all prepaid Items shall be attached to this project application. COST ITEM RESOURCE CATEGORY COST 1) \$\_\_\_\_\_ 2) 3) TOTAL OF PREPAID ITEMS REPAIR/REPLACEMENT or NEW/EXPANSION 3.5 This section need only be completed if the Project is to be funded by \$12 funds: TOTAL PORTION OF PROJECT REPAIR/REPLACEMENT State Issue 2 Funds for Repair/Replacement (Not to Exceed 90%) TOTAL PORTION OF PROJECT NEW/EXPANSION State Issue 2 Funds for New/Expansion (Not to Exceed 50%) For schedule purposes only. See project 4.0 PROJECT SCHEDULE application for all additional information. **ESTIMATED ESTIMATED** START DATE **COMPLETE DATE**

05 / 01 / 92

08 / 12 / 92 08 / 26 / 92

09 / 15 / 92 06 / 30 / 93

08 / 01 / 92

ENGR. DESIGN

CONSTRUCTION

BID PROCESS

4.1

4.2

4.3

## 5.0 APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

The Applicant Certifies That:

As the official representative of the Applicant, the undersigned certifies that: (1) he/she is legally empowered to represent the applicant in both requesting and accepting financial assistance as provided under Chapter 164 of the Ohio Revised Code and 164-1 of the Ohio Administrative Code; (2) that to the best of his/her knowledge and belief, all representations that are a part of this application are true and correct; (3) that all official documents and commitments of the applicant that are a part of this application have been duly authorized by the governing body of the Applicant; (4) and, should the requested financial assistance be provided, that in the execution of this project, the Applicant will comply with all assurances required by Ohio law, including those involving minority business utilization, Buy Ohio, and prevailing wages.

IMPORTANT: Applicant certifies that physical construction on the project as defined in this application has not begun, and will not begin, until a Project Agreement on this project has been issued by the Ohio Public Works Commission. Action to the contrary is evidence that OPWC funds are not necessary to complete this project.

IMPORTANT: In the event of a project cost underrun, applicant understands that the identified local match share (sections 3.2(a) through 3.2(c) will be paid in full toward completion of this project. Unneeded OPWC funds will be returned to the funding source from which the project was financed.

HAL	L. P	PANKE - Chief ExecutiVE Office
Certifyi	ng R	epresentative (Type Name and Title)
Zlay	12:	Franke 12-30-91
Signatu	ire/D	åte Signed
Applicant application	shall c n:	theck each of the statements below, confirming that all required information is included in this
<u>X</u>		A five-year Capital improvements Report as required in 164-1-31 of the Ohio Administrative Code and a two-year Maintenance of Local Effort Report as required in 164-1-12 of the Ohio Administrative Code.
X		A registered professional engineer's estimate of useful life as required in 164-1-13 of the Ohio Administrative Code. Estimate shall contain engineer's original seal and signature.
<u> </u>		A registered professional engineer's estimate of cost as required in 164-1-14 and 164-1-16 of the Ohio Administrative Code. Estimate shall contain engineer's original seal and signature.
<u> </u>		A certified copy of the legislation by the governing body of the applicant authorizing a designated official to submit this application and to execute contracts.
<u> </u>	YES N/A	A copy of the cooperation agreement(s) (for projects involving more than one subdivision or district).
<u>x</u>	YES N/A	Copies of all invoices and warrants for those items identified as "pre-paid" in section 4.4 of this application.

## 6.0 DISTRICT COMMITTEE CERTIFICATION

William W. Brayshaw, Chairman, District 2 Integrating Committee
Certifying Representative (Type Name and Title)
William W. Braysha 4-20-9 z Signature/Date Signed
Signature/Date Signed

## FIVE YEAR PLAN FOR USE OF OHIO INFRASTRUCTURE BOND MONIES

#### PURPOSE

The purpose of this document is to establish a plan for monies obtained through Ohio's Infrastructure Bond sale and to address needs, costs, completion time frames and income streams. It is also designed to establish a priority listing of infrastructure needs and projects.

#### INVENTORY

Delhi Township has a road network which includes forty nine and eighty three hundreths (49.83) miles of road surface and the ensuing right of way. It also maintains an administration and a police building, two (2) maintenance garages, two (2) fire stations, a senior citizens center, a historical landmark and a cemetery. Additionally, it maintains thirteen hundred and fifty plus (1350+) catch basins and many miles of storm sewer pipes, as well as seven (7) storm water culverts.

#### CURRENT CONDITION

The Township is utilizing a 1.5 mill Road and Bridge levy since 1985 to repair and maintain its' road network. This levy translates into approximately \$330,000.00 per year. This levy expires after 1994. The Township has had levy money with which to repair its' road network since 1985. The levy money has been used to repair as many roads as possible but has not had the opportunity to deal with total "reconstruction" projects. Issue 2 funding could help greatly with these reconstruction costs.

Furthermore, in 1987, the Hamilton County Public Works Department changed their regulations to make townships within the county responsible for certain aspects of storm water drainage. This is a new experience for the Township and consequently many new problems exist as a result of this change. Currently, the Township does not have the equipment, manpower or funds to maintain these storm sewer systems. Furthermore, the County does not have a master plan showing the location or depths of these systems.

#### PRIORITIES

The first priority for this funding would be for road reconstruction on all streets within the Township, which, due to the extensive nature of the work needed, the Township has not

been able to accomplish. These roads are in need of complete reconstruction including new drainage systems. They are listed below with an approximate amount of cost.

STR	eet.	APPROXIMATE COST
	Chantilly Woods Subdivision	\$ 1,480,859.00
	Briarhill Lane/Anders Court	\$ 320,496.50
3)	Ihle Drive	\$ 207,053.50
	Ivyhill Subdivision	\$ 354,360.00
5)	Bob/Don Subdivision	\$ 565,921.00
	Mapleton/Groton Drive	\$ 224,510.00
	Victory Drive	\$ 150,000.00
	Virgil Drive	\$ 50,000.00
9)	South Delridge Drive	\$ 50,000.00
	Felicia Drive	\$ 75,000.00
11)	Muirwood Drive	\$ 112,000.00
	Grand Total	\$ 3,590,199.00

Additionally, this type of funding could be used to reconstruct damaged storm sewer systems which are now the responsibility of Delhi Township to maintain. Due to the lack of records available, lack of visibility of these systems and the Township's lack of experience in this type of repair, it is virtually impossible to estimate a cost factor at this time.

However, there are many areas where the original developer was allowed to run street storm water drainage via storm drainage pipes to the rear yards of the development consequently causing erosion problems throughout the township. Listed below are some of those areas and the approximate cost to enclose these systems.

SUBDIVISION	LOTS	COST
FOLEY FOREST	43-45-46-58-59	5,200.00
EILEEN GARDENS	21-22-23-24-16-17-27-28	7,520.00
AREA SERVICE (#2)	20-21	2,170.00
MT. ALVERNO	218-219-220	3,500.00
	245-246-247	5,420.00
CANDLERIDGE	22-23	1,870.00
DELHIVIEW	19-20	2,030.00
		·
GRAND TOTAL	•	27,710.00

#### DEPARTMENTAL OVERVIEW

The Township will continue to repair and rehabilitate as well as handling routine maintenance (crack sealing, surface treatment, etc.) on it's road network through in-house personnel and outside contracts through approved levies and other road

funds. Issue 2 funding, as stated previously, is intended to be used first for reconstruction contracts and secondly for storm drainage erosion restitution.

## TWO YEAR MAINTENANCE EFFORT LOCAL FUNDING 1990 & 1991

#### PROJECTS-REHABILITATION & REPAIR

#### 1990 STREETS REHABILITATED

Andy Court--Betty Drive--Centerview Court--Glenoaks
Drive--Hollowview Lane--Montview Drive--Mystical Rose
Lane--Patron Court--Pinallas Court--Wilderness Trail--Willnet
Drive
TOTAL PROJECT COST - \$144,652.00

#### 1990 STREETS RECONSTRUCTED

Allenford Court--Covedale Avenue TOTAL PROJECT COST - \$298,600.00

#### 1991 STREETS REHABILITATED

Beechmeadow Lane--Coachman Court--Courier Court--Debonhill
Drive- Eaglepoint Drive--Fairdale Drive--Hickok Drive--Kitty
Lane--Picuda Court--Redstar Drive--Riverama Drive--Starcrest
Drive--Viscount Drive
TOTAL PROJECT COST - \$179,600.00

#### 1991 STREETS RECONSTRUCTED

Faysel Drive--Viewland Drive--Burhen Drive--Samoht Ridge--Leath Road--Orchardview Lane--Elm Street--Plum Street TOTAL PROJECT COST - \$1,199,000.00

#### FUNDING SOURCE

Funding for the 1990 rehabilitation projects were provided by the Township's Road and Bridge Fund which was supported by a 1.9 mill tax levy. In November of 1989 this levy was renewed at a lower rate of 1.5 mills. This 1.5 mill money will be used in the upcoming five years for additional rehabilitation projects. In addition to the money spent in 1990 and 1991 for reconstruction, the money spent for reconstruction came from Community Development Block Grant Funding, State of Ohio Issue Two Funds and the Townships' Road and Bridge Fund.

SIZP-ROUND 5 04-DEC-1991

	04-000-1991	202	203	301	304	304	403	404	A S S	7 V	7 7 8	A CO	2	h 0	
	HELL	PAVEMENT	UNDER	BIT. AGG.	mie KS	THE	AC. SCR.	AC. SUR.	AC. SUR. PPC CONCRETE	12*	C.B.	SAN. H.H.	SAN. H.H. STH. H.H.	H.V.	
		REHOVAL	CUT	BASE	STONE	STONE	COURSE	COURSE	PAVEMENT(7*)	adīd	RECON	RECON	RECON	RECON	
	MEASURE	S.Y.	C.Y.	C.Y.	C.Y.	C.Y.	C.Y.	C.Y.	S.Y.	L.F.	EA.	EA.	EA.	EA.	
	COST	5.00	10.00	65.00	30.00	30.00	55.00	55.00	90.00	25.00	700.00	250.00	300.00	300.00	
NUMBER	STREET						; ; ; ; ; ; ;		; ; ; ; ;	1	-				,
щ	anders	1390.00	463.00	185.00	348.00	116.00	31.00	31.00	240.00	125.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	i
	SUBTOTAL	6950.00	4630.00	12025.00	10440.00	3480.00	1705.00	1705.00	21600.00	3125.00	2100.00	250.00	600.00	600.00	
ы	BRIARHILL	2862.00	954.00	382.00	715.00	239.00	64.00	64.00	400.00	400.00	8.00	1.00	3.00	0.00	
•	SUBTOTAL	14310.00	9540.00	24830.00	21450.00	7170.00	3520.00	3520.00	36000.00	10000.00	5600.00	250.00	900.00	0.00	12360.00
	HOS AHOT	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	SUBTOTAL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	00 • 00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	CONTINGENCIES	0.00	100.00	50.00	150.00	50.00	20.00	20.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	SUBTOTAL	0.00	1000.00	3250.00	4500.00	1500.00	1100.00	1100.00	900.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	TOTAL QUANTITY	4252.00	.1517.00	617.00	1213.00	405.00	115.00	115.00	650.00	525.00	11.00	2.00	5.00	2.00	5620.00
	TOTAL COST	21260.00	15170.00	40105.00	36390.00	12150.00	6325.00	6325.00	58500.00	13125.00	7700.00	500.00	1500.00	600.00	16860.00

USEFUL LIFE:

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT UPON SATISFACTORY COMPLETION OF THIS WORK, THE USEFUL LIFE OF THE STREETS ON THIS PROJECT WILL BE AT LEAST 20 YEARS.

SI2P-ROUND 5

320496. 50	31100.00	7126.50	3650	3675.00	500d.00	7000, 00	2 6 4 3 5 5 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6	TOTAL COST	
320496.50	3110.00	4751.00	365.00	735.00	1.00	1.00	3110.00	TOTAL QUANTITY	
17275.00	500.00	750.00	500.00	250.00	0.00	0.00	425.00	SUBTOTAL	
	50.00	500.00	50.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	CONTINGENCIES	
13000 0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	7000.00	0.00	LUMP SUM	
195901.50	20600.00	4291.50	1750.00	2300.00	0.00	0.00	17510.00	SUBTOTAL	
	2060.00	2861.00	175.00	460.00	0.00	0.00	2060.00	BRIARHILL	Ŋ
95320.00	1000.00	1390.00	140.00	225.00 1125.00	0.00	0.00	1000.00	ANDERS SUBTOTAL	. 1
								STREET	NUMBER
	10.00	1.50	10.00	5.00	5000.00	7000.00	8.50	COST	
	L.F.	s.y.	L.F.	g.y.	L.S.	L.S.	L.F.	MEASURE	
FOLDER	DRAINS	FABRIC	SPOUTS	t	STAKES	TRAFFIC			
N. TATPOPP	TAS	SPL	TdS	500	619 LAYOUT	614	609	HELL	
								04~DEC-1991	
								SI2P-ROUND 5	

÷

### STATUS OF FUNDS

This is to certify that Delhi Township's portion of the funding for this project will become available on January 1, 1992.

Robert A Bedinghaus Township Clerk & Chief Fiscal Officer

# DELHI TOWNSHIP, OHIO

ROAD MAINTENANCE 665 NEEB ROAD DELHI TOWNSHIP CINCINNATI, OHIO 45233 Administrative Offices Fire Department Police Department Rord Department Department Of Development Services

513/922-2011 513/922-0060 513/922-8609

513/922-3111

513/922-3111

#### Resolution 92-

Trustee Espelage moved and Trustee LaScalea seconded to apply to the Issue 2 District Integrating Committee for the below mentioned projects and to appoint Hal L. Franke as Chief Executive Officer, Robert A. Bedinghaus as Chief Fiscal Officer, and Robert W. Bass as Project Manager.

Streets being requested for Issue 2 Infrastructure Bond Applications for 1992:

- 1. Chantilly Woods Subdivision Reconstruction
  - Cost \$1,480,859.00
- 2. Briarhill Lane/Anders Court Reconstruction
   Cost \$320,496.50
- 3. Duebbers Subdivision Reconstruction
  - Cost \$565,921.00
- 4. Ihle Drive Reconstruction
  - Cost \$207053.50

The total request to the Issue 2 Integrating Committee is \$2,574,330.00

Trustees Espelage, LaScalea and Franke voted age at roll call. Motion carried.



#### Certificate of Clerk

It is hereby certified that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Delhi Township Board of Trustees in session on January 8, 1992.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand this 8th day of January, 1992.

Robert A. Bedinghaus, Township Clerk

# URBAN INVENTORY FORM SECTION IDENTIFICATION

SECTION NO: (0 TO QUIT) 374.0 DATE: 02/23/90 COMPLETED BY: MEB

STATE RT #: 42 NAME: ANDERS COURT LENGTH (FT): 500.0

FROM: BRIARHILL DRIVE TO: BOTH ENDS

FUNCTIONAL CLASS: L R.O.W. WIDTH: 50.0 SUBDIVISION: HILAND PRK

PAVEMENT INFORMATION

PAVEMENT TYPE: 3 WIDTH: 25.2 # TRAVEL LANES: 1 # PARKING LANES: 1

SHOULDER INFORMATION

LEFT SHOULDER TYPE: 4 WIDTH: 12.0 RIGHT SHOULDER TYPE: 4 WIDTH: 12.0

DRAINAGE INFORMATION

L CURB HT("): 3.0 # INLETS: 0 0 0 R CURB HT("): 3.0 # INLETS: 0 0 0

LENGTH: TYPE: 0 0 0 LENGTH: TYPE: 0 0 0

TRAFFIC INFORMATION

CURRENT ADT: 44 % TRUCKS: 1.0 YEAR: 1990 ESTIMATED: 1

PROJECTED ADT: 0 % TRUCKS: 0.0 YEAR: 0 TRANSIT/BUS ROUTE: 0

UTILITIES INFORMATION

# MANHOLES: 6 # UTILITY BOX COVERS: Ø ELECTRICAL: Ø TELEPHONE: Ø

ELECTRIC OWNER: C.G.&E. GAS OWNER: C.G.&E.

TELEPHONE OWNER: Cinti. Bell OWNER WATER: Cinti Water Works

LIGHTING OWNER: C.G.&E. SEWER OWNER: M.S.D.

CABLE TV OWNER: United Video STORM OWNER:

### STRUCTURE INFORMATION

DATE	THICKNESS	TYPE	STRUCTURE PAVEMENT	S
0	0.00			
0	0.00			
. 0	0.00			

URBAN DISTRESS DATA FORM CO	MPOSITE PAVEMENT			
STREET: ANDERS COURT FROM: BRIARHILL DRIVE		SECTION NO. INPUT MAINTENANCE		5
TO: BOTH ENDS DATE SURVEYED (MM/YY): 11/91		% CURB DETERIORAT	NOI:	70
DISTRESS TYPE	SEVERIT			
SWELL	1	Δ		

DISTRESS TYPE SWELL	SEVERITY 1	PERCENTAGE OF AREA 4
BOND LOSS	1	AREA 2 KEY
REFLECTIVE CRACKING	3	4 0 = 0% 1 = 1-5%
SLIPPAGE CRACKING	0	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
WEATHERING AND RAVELLING	3	4 4 = 51-100%

SEVERITY

KEY Ø = NONE ; 1 = LOW ; 2 = MODERATE ; 3 = HIGH

PCI = 1.0

PRESS ANY KEY TO CONTINUE...

## COMPOSITE PAVEMENT DISTRESS DATA FORM

DATE	SECTION NO. 374
STREET NAME ANDRES	INSPECTED BY
FROM BEINELL	MAINTENANCE FACTOR
TO AD- TO TO TO THE STATE OF TH	% CURB DETERIORATION 5

		PERCENTAGE OF AREA							
DISTRESS TYPE	SEVERIT	Y	1-5%	6-25%	26-50%	51-100%			
	LOW	2	5	. 10	15	20			
SWELL	MODERATE	2	10	15	30	40			
	HIGH	2	20	35	45	50			
	LOW	2	5	10	10	10			
BOND LOSS	MODERATE	2	10	20	25	25			
	HIGH	2	20	35	45	45			
	LOW	1	О	5	10	15			
REFLECTIVE CRACKING	MODERATE	2	5	15	20	25			
	HIGH	2	10	30	35	40			
CURRACE.	LOW	2	5	15	20	25			
SLIPPAGE   CRACKING	MODERATE	2	10	20	30	<i>35</i>			
	HIGH	2	15	35	40	45			
	LOW	1	О	5	10	15			
WEATHERING & RAVELING	MODERATE	1	5	10	15	20			
701722770	HIGH	1	15	20	25	30			
			·						
			·		·				
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							

<sup>1-</sup> PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE RELATED

S- STRUCTURAL RELATED

PAVEMENT CONDITION INDEX

DELHI TOWNSHIP ROAD PROJECT COST ESTIMATE

** \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	COST ESTIMATE	*********	******
NAME: ANDERS			
REPAIR	QUANTITY	PRICE /PER	COST
1.CURB :	1000 L.E.		:
	14.0 c. F		<del>-</del>
	4 <sub>EA</sub> :		:
4.SAN.M.H adj. :	) <u>e 4</u>		;
5. JOINT MEMBRANE :	:		:
6. PARTIAL DEPTH :	1000L.F.		:
7.RIGID REMOVAL :	•		
8.301 :			
9.403 :	•		
10.404 :	40 yk :		:
11. CB adj. (2" P.C.P :	125 L.F.	7	:
12.CB rec. :	4 <u>ea</u> :	,	:
13. EXCAVATION UNDERCUT	463yb3 :		:
14. ENBANKHENT#2's :	348 y 23 :		:
15.ROAD FABRIC :	1390 NZ :		:
· 16.EXC.w/emb :			:
17.EXC.W/301 B-19 :	116 463 :		:
SKETCH:	1000 FT2		
DRIVES:	240 VD2		
SOD INC SOIL:	2 25 yb2		,

## URBAN INVENTORY FORM SECTION IDENTIFICATION

SECTION NO: (0 TO QUIT) 373.0 DATE: 02/23/90 COMPLETED BY: MEB STATE RT #: 41 NAME: BRIARHILL DRIVE LENGTH (FT): 1030.0 FROM: ORANGELAWN DRIVE TO: ANDERSON FERRY ROAD FUNCTIONAL CLASS: C R.O.W. WIDTH: 50.0 SUBDIVISION: HIGHLAND P PAVEMENT INFORMATION PAVEMENT TYPE: 3 WIDTH: 25.0 # TRAVEL LANES: 0 # PARKING LANES: SHOULDER INFORMATION LEFT SHOULDER TYPE: 0 WIDTH: 12.0 RIGHT SHOULDER TYPE: 0 WIDTH: 12.0 DRAINAGE INFORMATION L CURB HT("): 3.0 # INLETS: 0 0 0 R CURB HT("): 3.0 # INLETS: 0 0 0 LENGTH: TYPE: 0 0 0 LENGTH: TYPE: 0 0 0 TRAFFIC INFORMATION CURRENT ADT: 324 % TRUCKS: 1.0 YEAR: 1990 ESTIMATED: 1 PROJECTED ADT: 0 % TRUCKS: 0.0 YEAR: 0 TRANSIT/BUS ROUTE: 0

UTILITIES INFORMATION

# MANHOLES: 3 # UTILITY BOX COVERS: Ø ELECTRICAL: Ø TELEPHONE: Ø

ELECTRIC OWNER: C.G.&E. GAS OWNER: C.G.&E.

TELEPHONE OWNER: Cinti. Bell OWNER WATER: Cinti Water Works

LIGHTING OWNER: C.G.&E. SEWER OWNER: M.S.D.

CABLE TV OWNER: United Video STORM OWNER:

### STRUCTURE INFORMATION

STRUCTURE PAVEMENT	TYPE	THICKNESS	DATE
		0.00	0
		0.00	Ø
•		0.00	0

FROM: ORANGELAWN DRIVE TO: ANDERSON FERRY ROAD DATE SURVEYED (MM/YY): 11/91	' INE	PUT MAINTENANCE CURB DETERIORAT JGHNESS INDEX: (	ION: 60
DISTRESS TYPE SWELL	SEVERITY 2	PERCENTAGE (	OF AREA
BOND LOSS	3	2	AREA KEY
REFLECTIVE CRACKING	3	4	0 = 0%
SLIPPAGE CRACKING	0	Ø	1 = 1-5% 2 = 6-25% 3 = 26-50%
WEATHERING AND RAVELLING	3	4	4 = 51-100%
SEVERITY			

0 = NONE; 1 = LOW; 2 = MODERATE; 3 = HIGH

PCI = 1.0

SECTION NO: 373.0

PRESS ANY KEY TO CONTINUE...

KEY

STREET: BRIARHILL DRIVE

URBAN DISTRESS DATA FORM COMPOSITE PAVEMENT

#### DELHI TOWNSHIP ROAD PROJECT COST ESTIMATE

Section #	<i>373</i>	* *	* *	*	* *	r **	*	<b>*</b> 7	· *	*	*	*	* /	Ar :	* *	<b>x</b>	*	*	*	*	*	À
															E							
											$\mathbf{r}$	v.	ıπ	_		п	u	u.	r.	L	1	

NAME: BRIBEHILL			**********
REPAIR	QUANTITY	PRICE /PER	COST
1.CURB :	2060L.F.	:	
	1754.5	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
3.STM.M.H adj. :	SEA	:	
A SAN M H ada	IEA	:	
5.JOINT WENBRANE :		:	
6. PARTINE BEPTA	2060 L.F.	:	
7.RIGID REMOVAL :	9865 AF5	;	
8.301 :		:	
9.403 :	•	:	
10.404 :		:	
11. CB adj. 12" R.C.P :			
12.CB rec. :	BEA	:	
13.EXCAVATION :	954712	:	
14.EMBANKHBNP 中入 : :	715112		<del></del>
15.ROAD FABRIC :	2863 40 <sup>2</sup>	:	
16.EXC.w/emb:	·	:	
17.EXC.W/301 B-19:	239453	:	
SKETCH: 51DEWALK:	4120 FT2		
DRIVES :	400 yoz		
SONINC Soil:	460402		

## COMPOSITE PAVEMENT DISTRESS DATA FORM

DATE 11-19 01	SECTION NO. 373
STREET NAME BRIADHILL	INSPECTED BY
FROM ORANGE (FAMILY	MAINTENANCE FACTOR
70 A. F.	% CURB DETERIORATION 50

			Pl	RCFNTAG	E OF ARI	-A
DISTRESS TYPE	SEVERIT	ΓΥ 	1-5%	6-25%	26-50%	51-100%
	LOW	2	5	10	15	20
SWELL	MODERATE	2	10	15	30	(40)
	HIGH	2	20	35	45	50
5045 L000	LOW	2	5	10	10	10
BOND LOSS	MODERATE	2	10	20	25	25
	HIGH	2	20	35	45	45
DEEL COTIVE	LOW	1	0	5	10	15 ·
REFLECTIVE CRACKING	MODERATE	2	5	15	20	25
	HIGH	2	10	30	35	40)
CURRACE	LOW	2	5	15	20	<i>2</i> 5
SLIPPAGE CRACKING	MODERATE	2	10	20	30	35
	HIGH	2	15	35	40	45
	LOW	1	O	5	10	15
WEATHERING &   RAVELING	MODERATE	1	5	10	15	20
TVTVLENVO	HIGH	1	15	20	25	(30)
·						

<sup>1-</sup> PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE RELATED

2- STRUCTUPAL PELATED

PAVEMENT
CONDITION INDEX

ANDERS COURT	Poor	0.09
BANDANNA DRIVE	Poor	0.06
BANDANNA DRIVE	Poor	0.10
BEECHMEADOW DRIVE	Poor	0.13
BEECHMEADOW DRIVE	Poor	0.15
BETLIN COURT	Poor	0.04
BOB DRIVE	Poor	0.21
BOUTIQUE DRIVE	Poor	0.11
BRIARHILL DRIVE	Poor	0.20
BROSS COURT	Poor	0.06
BURHEN DRIVE	Poor	0.14
CANNAS DRIVE	Poor	0.11
CANNAS DRIVE	Poor	0.15
CASUAL COURT	Poor	0.14
CHAMPDALE LANE	Poor	0.11
CHAPELACRES DRIVE	Poor	0.07
CHAPELHILL DRIVE	Poor	0.17
CHAPELVIEW DRIVE	Poor	0.06
CIMMARON TRAIL	Poor	0.07
CIMMARON TRAIL	Poor	0.12
CLAYMORE TERRACE	Poor	0.10
CLEANDER DRIVE	Poor	0.19
CLEANDER DRIVE	Poor	0.11
COACHMAN COURT	Poor	0.09
COURIER COURT	Poor	0.08
DEBONHILL COURT	Poor	0.10
	Poor	0.06
DON LANE	Poor	0.22
DON LANE	Poor	0.04
DRESDEN COURT DRYHORSE COURT	Poor	0.05
	Poor	0.08
DUNDAS DRIVE	Poor	0.06
EDFEL WAY	Poor	0.10
ELM STREET	Poor	0.17
FAYSEL DRIVE	Poor	0.04
FELICIA DRIVE GENENBIL DRIVE	Poor	0.14
GILES COURT	Poor	0.11
GLES COOKT GLENOAKS DRIVE	Poor	0.17
GLENOAKS DRIVE	Poor	0.12
GLENOARS DRIVE	Poor	0.11
GREENWELL ROAD	Poor	0.14
GROTON COURT	Poor	0.06
HALIDONHILL DRIVE	Poor	0.18
HALIDONHILL DRIVE	Poor	0.19
	Poor	0.19
HAPPY DRIVE	Poor	0.06
HAPPY DRIVE	Poor	0.15
HICKOK LANE	Poor	0.12
HICKOK LANE	Poor	0.09
HICKORYKNOLL DRIVE	Poor	0.08
HICKORYKNOLL DRIVE		0.15
HILLIARD DRIVE	Poor	0.27
IHLE ROAD	Poor	0.11
JUDY LANE	Poor	0.11
LEATH ROAD	Poor	0.18
LINNEMAN DRIVE	Poor	0.10
•		

TOTALS 6.73

LOBOB COURT	Poor	0.04
MAPLETON AVENUE	Poor	0.06
MARGE PLACE	Poor	0.08
ORCHARDVIEW LANE	Poor	0.16
PLUM STREET	Poor	0.09
REVMAL LANE	Poor	0.03
RIVERAMA DRIVE	Poor	0.20
ROCKWELL ROAD	Poor	0.08
SAMOHT RIDGE	Poor	0.16
SAMOHT RIDGE	Poor	0.12
SEBASTIAN COURT	Poor	0.08
SEBASTIAN COURT	Poor	0.13
STYLE LANE	Poor	0.22
SULTANA DRIVE	Poor	0.19
SUNDANCE DRIVE	Poor	0.10
TAHOE TERRACE	Poor	0.12
THUNDERHILL LANE	Poor	0.07
THUNDERHILL LANE	Poor	0.29
TIMBERDALE COURT	Poor	0.10
TIMELY TERRACE	Poor	0.10
TIMELY TERRACE	Poor	0.07
TIMELY TERRACE	Poor	0.02
TROUBADOR COURT	Poor	0.10
TROUBADOR COURT	Poor	0.12
TURTLEDOVE DRIVE	Poor	0.09
VICTORY DRIVE	Poor	0.19
VIEWLAND DRIVE	Poor	0.09
VIRGIL ROAD	Poor	0.04
VISCOUNT DRIVE	Poor	0.15
VISCOUNT DRIVE	Poor	0.12
WOODCREEK COURT	Poor	0.04

10.18

AUD-4254A (Revised 12/89)

## Auditor of State FINANCIAL REPORT OF TOWNSHIPS



	For Fiscal Year Ending December 31, 1990	
DELHI	lownship, County ofIIAHJILITON	

"This is an unaudiled Financial Report"

		S	UMMARY O	)F CA	SH BALANC	ES, RECEIPTS AI	AD EX	(PENDITURES	
Line No.			FUNDS A		TOTAL EXPENDABLE TRUST AND AGENCY FUNDS		NON- EXPENDABLE TRUST FUNDS	TOTALS & FUND BALANCE	
10	RECEIPTS	S:		* 1	HEVENUE	RECEIPTS 1	171	理學 OPERATING 版	18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 1
02	Tures			2 9	03,892.08		THE S	雪麗 AFCENIAS 是	2.903.892.08
U.I	Charges to			1				<b>拉斯斯斯斯斯</b>	
0.4		ennis and Fees	<del></del>		<u> 15,425,00                                   </u>		[KY	語學和的個別語句	15,425,00
- 05	Fines and I				32,937.57			<b>"国际的国际对于</b>	32,937,57
436		imental Ruceipls		1.2	73,188,24			即風影響時間開	1,273,188,24
0/	Special As	sessments			10,775.79			<b>原的推翻的</b>	10.775.79
011	Interest			2	92,497,16		(6)		292,497,16
	Cults					MANAGE HEALTH	05		
09	All Other R				28,887.87		06		128,997.87
10	TOTAL RE			4,6	<u>57,603.71</u>		DIL		4,657,603.71
	DISBURS				EXPENDITURE	DISBURSEMENTS	1136		
. 13	General Go	remaned			78,870.61		1. 静山	PR DISBURSEMENTS	778,870.61
1-#	Public Safe	<del></del>		2,2	41,065.75		四部	<b>自知,据悉如此。</b> 直示	2,241,065,75
15	Public Wall	ks		8	44,614,80		1.25	<b>全面 1898年前 至少</b>	844,614.80
16	Flealth				21.586.36		144	<b>克莱·维尔斯森 作用</b>	21,586.36
-17	Human Sor	<del></del>					100	<b>建筑建筑建筑 中</b> 华	
181	Constayaha	m-Recreation					3.	50倍,130倍,克·勒克	
19	Miscellanes							<b>全国的基础</b>	
20	Capital Out	lay		2	80.230.98		13		280, 230, 98
29	Debt Service	iti					1	可與時候的原理的	E11U. 4 1U. 7(1
2;1	Dond Pr	incapal Payment			-			<b>经过度的</b>	
20	Mote Pn	ncipal Paymed						HAME BELLEVICE WE	
24	Intraest	and Fiscal Charges					1	· 生活物 水基 矿石	
	Personal Sc	ifvicus		76.5	走 在 安温斯	的好物的一种	10	2. 20.13.00.0 (13.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00	
	Contract Su	rvicus		2.124 (2)	ASSESSED AND ASSESSED.	W. A. A. D. H. C. A. M.	11		
	Suppless an	d Malerials				高的特別的特別			
	TOTAL DIS	BURSEMENTS			66.368.50	A STATE OF THE STA	<del>  ''</del>	<del></del> -	4,166,368.50
						FFEEDE AND AND	. 3		AND MINERAL TWO
27	Total Reces	pts Over/(Under)Des	b		91.235.21	40 F 1 12 11 14 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	17	a megana akin angki 🛊 inagsang	
$\neg$	The state of the s				SOURCES (USFS)	<del> '</del>	NUN-OPERATING	491,235,21	
79	Prenends of Bonds		T	THE STATE OF STREET	2001(4.3 (0.11.1)	3700		的 15 1 A 2 2 2 2 1 2 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	
70	Proceeds of		<del></del>	1			3-15	HECCIPIS (DISB)	
	Operating I			1	1.2,935.48	<del></del>	<del></del>	A PRINCESS AND STONESS AND STONESS	130 030 44
		ronsters-Out			12,935.48)		35		112,935.48
	Advances-le		<del></del>			<del></del>	316 334 34	Barrio II anno de la companio de la comp	(112,935.48)
	Advances-C				10,520.00			<b>克克斯奥尔奥斯</b>	10,520.00
		es/Receipts		<del> </del> -	10,520.00)		1965		(10,520.00)
$\overline{}$		Chaharaementa	<del> </del>	<del> </del>	2,130,95		29		2,130,95
		IER LINANCING SOI	INCERTIFIED		2 120 05		30		
		& Other Smarces Ov		7 1	2,130,95	91-71-12 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			2,130.95
	Distr & Office		vur (Under)			里如此[0]。1754	100	表现 含现金	4. 计数数数据
		latance, January 1,			93.366.16		46)	·	493.366.16
		falance, December 3	11 Jaan	1441	58,956.15		41		2,858,956,15
4.1	Heseron In	Encembrances, Dec	31 1000	<u> </u>	52, 322, 31		431		3.152.322.31
		compina.es, 136C	31. 1770	/	04,724.14		4.1		704.724.14
								Fond Cash Cale	
	MARY OF	OUTSTANDING	NEW ISSUE	is T	RETIRED	OUTSTANDING		Fund Cash Balance	1 015
INDEB	TEDNESS	Jan. 1, 19				Dec. 31, 19		Depository Balance	1,015,878.59
Т	OTAL	0	0		0	ļ ————————————————————————————————————		Investments	2,500,000.00
		<u> </u>	<u>.</u>			00		Cash on Hand	0.00
								Outstanding Co.	3,515,878,59
						(163.556.28)			
I coulty the following report to be correct and true, to the best They knowledge.  DELHT TOWNSHIP CLERK									
1/.	(Chief Fiscal Officer Title)					Concertine)			
يا∨ك	3/21/91 934 NEEB ROAD								
(0	Olset Cryfal (	Otherr Sign Above)			(Date)	<del></del> .		(filteer /	\iddress)
R	OBEW A	. BEDINGIAUS	/5131	922	-3111		<b>(77)</b>		,
Dyne of Prof Name Calculators One One One									
• •			( i Cii	[	•1	(Cily t	a Aggrill	1.)	t/m

## ADDITIONAL SUPPORT INFORMATION

For Fiscal Year 1993, jurisdictions shall complete the State application form for Issue 2, Small Government, or Local Transportation Improvement Program (LTIP) funding. In addition, the District 2 Integrating Committee requests the following information to determine which projects are funded. Information provided on both forms should be accurate, based on reliable engineering principles. Do NOT request a specific type of funding desired, as this is decided by the District Integrating Committee.

 Of the total infrastructure within the jurisdiction which is similar to the infrastructure of this project, what percentage can be classified as being in poor condition, adequacy and/or serviceability? Accurate support information, such as pavement management inventories or bridge condition summaries, must be provided to substantiate the stated percentage.

Typical examples are:

Road percentage= Miles of road that are in poor condition Total miles of road within jurisdiction

Storm percentage= Miles of storm sewers that are in poor condition Total miles of storm sewers within jurisdiction

Bridge percentage= Number of bridges that are in poor condition

Number of bridges within jurisdiction

10.18 miles in poor condition divided by 49.83 miles in jurisdiction equals

20.4% of roadway in poor condition

 What is the condition of the existing infrastructure to be replaced, repaired, or expanded? For bridges, submit a copy of the latest general appraisal and condition rating.

Give a brief statement of the nature of the deficiency of the present facility such as: inadequate load capacity (bridge); surface type and width; number of lanes; structural condition; substandard design elements such as berm width, grades, curves, sight distances, drainage elements or inadequate service capacity. If known, give the structures, or inadequate service capacity. If known, give the approximate age of the infrastructure to be replaced, repaired, or expanded.

These streets were built in the mid 1950's. Surfaces are composite with 25' widths.

Road surfaces are in poor condition with standing water. 25-45% of sidewalks

are failed and unsafe.

3.	If State Issue 2 funds are awarded, how soon (in weeks or months after completion of the agreement with OPWC would the opening of bid occur? The Integrating Committee will be reviewing schedule submitted for previous projects to help judge the accuracy of particular jurisdiction's anticipated schedule.  Four to five months
	Please indicate the current status of the project development b circling the appropriate answers below. PROVIDE ACCURATE ESTIMATE.
	a) Has the Consultant been selected? Yes No N/A
	b) Preliminary development or engineering completed? Yes No N/A
	c) Detailed construction plans completed? Yes No N/A
	d) All right-of-way acquired? Yes No N/A
	e) Utility coordination completed? Yes No N/A
	Give estimate of time, in weeks or months, to complete any item above not yet completed.
	b) 2 months - c) 2 months
4.	How will the proposed infrastructure activity impact the general health, welfare, and safety of the service area? (Typical example include the effects of the completed project on accident rates emergency response time, fire protection, health hazards, use benefits, and commerce.)
	Upgrading road surfaces will help to remove a blighting influence on the area and
	improve safety and drainage. Sidewalk replacement will cure pedestrian safety haza
5.	For any project involving GRANTS, the local jurisdiction must provide a MINIMUM OF 10% of the anticipated construction cost Additionally, the local jurisdiction must pay 100% of the costs of preliminary engineering, inspection, and right-of-way. If a project is to be funded under Issue 2 or Small Government, the costs of an betterment/expansion are 100% local. Local matching funds must either be currently on deposit with the jurisdiction, or certified as having been approved or encumbered by an outside agency (MRF, CDBG, etc.) Proposed funding must be shown on the Project Application under Section 3.2, "Project Financial Resources". For a project involving LOANS or CREDIT ENHANCEMENTS, 100% of construction costs are eligible for funding, with no local match required.
	What matching funds are to be used for this project? (i.e. Federal State, MRF, Local, etc.)
	Delhi Township Road and Bridge Funds

100% engineering and 10% construction

extent are matching

percentage of anticipated CONSTRUCTION costs?

To what

funds to be utilized, expressed as  $\epsilon$ 

limits, truck restric	tions, and moratorious tions, and moratorious tions, and moratorious tions, and the ball tions are the ball tions.	ypical examples include weight ums or limitations on issuance N MUST HAVE AN ENGINEERING
COMPLETE BAN	PARTIAL BAN	NO BAN <u>X</u>
Will the ban be remove	d after the project	is completed? YES NO
Document with speci currently exists and w	fic information ex hat agency that impo	kplaining what type of bar osed the ban.
result of the propo households, traffic daily users, etc., and	sed project? Use counts, ridership	g users that will benefit as a e specific criteria such as figures for public transit, measurement of users:
ADT = 442 users		
Traffic by 1.2 occup to determine users pe be documented. Whe is partially close restriction. For s other related facili	ants per car (I.T.E r day. Ridership for re the facility curred, use documents torm sewers, sanif ties, multiply the	ent documented Average Daily estimated conversion factor) igures for public transit must rently has any restrictions or ed traffic counts prior to tary sewers, water lines, and e number of households in the ne approximate number of users
applying for project Improvement Plan tha include an invento improvements, and a l	funding develop t shall be update ry and condition ist detailing a sche Both Five-Year	uires that all jurisdictions a five year overall Capital ed annually. The Plan is to survey of existing capital edule for capital improvements overall and Five-Year Issue
		ed to the District Integrating plication is submitted.
Is the infrastructur regional significance size of service are length of route.) Pro	<pre>? (Consider the na a, trip lengths,</pre>	part of a facility that has umber of jurisdictions served, functional classification, and ormation.
Briarhill Iane connects a	primary township road (	Orangelawn) with a primary County
road (Anderson Ferry).		
	,	

Has any formal action by a federal, state, or local government agency resulted in a complete ban or partial ban of the use or expansion of

6.

#### OHIO INFRASTRUCTURE BOND PROGRAM (ISSUE 2) - ROUND 5

#### LOCAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (LTIP) - ROUND 4

#### FY 1993 PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA - 7/1/92 TO 6/30/93

ADOPTED BY DISTRICT 2 INTEGRATING COMMITTEE, 2/21/92

JURISDIC	TION/	AGENCY: DELHI TEU-
PROJECT	IDENT	IFICATION: BRIPEHILL / ANDERS
PROPOSED	FUND	ING:
ELIGIBLE	CATE	GORY:
POINTS		TOTAL POINTS FOR THIS PROJECT - 54
<u>[()</u>	1)	Type of project  10 Points - Bridge, road, stormwater  5 Points - All other projects
10	2)	If Issue 2/LTIP funds are granted, when would the construction contract be awarded? (Even though the jurisdictions will be asked this question, the Support Staff will assign points based on engineering experience.)  10 Points - Will definitely be awarded by end of 1992  5 Points - Some doubt as to whether it can be awarded by end of 1992  0 Points - No way it can be awarded in 1992
12	3)	What is the condition of the infrastructure to be replaced or repaired? For bridges, base condition on latest general appraisal and condition rating.  15 Points - Poor condition 12 Points - 9 Points - Fair to Poor condition 6 Points - 3 Points - Fair condition

NOTE: If infrastructure is in "good" or better condition, it will NOT be considered for Issue 2/LTIP funding, unless it is a betterment project that will improve serviceability.

- 10 Points Significantly effect on serviceability (e.g., widen to add lanes along entire project)
- 8 Points Moderate to significant effect on serviceability
- 6 Points Moderately effect on serviceability (e.g., widen existing lanes)
- 4 Points Little to no effect on serviceability
- 5) Of the total infrastructure within the jurisdiction which is similar to the infrastructure of this project, what portion can be classified as being in poor or worse condition, and/or inadequate in service?
  - 3 Points 50% and over
  - 2 Points 30% to 49.9%
  - 1 Point 10% to 29.9%
  - O Points Less than 10%



- 6) How important is the project to the HEALTH, SAFETY, and WELFARE of the public and the citizens of the District and/or the service area?
  - 10 Points Highly significant importance, with substantial impact on all 3 factors
  - 8 Points Considerably significant importance, with substantial impact on 2 factors OR noticeable impact on all 3 factors
  - 6 Points Moderate importance, with substantial impact on 1 factor or noticeable impact on 2 factors
  - 4 Points Minimal importance, with noticeable impact on 1 factor
  - 2 Points No measurable impact

- 10
- 7) What is the overall economic health of the jurisdiction?
  - 10 Points Poor
    - 8 Points -
    - 6 Points Fair
  - 4 Points -
    - 2 Points Excellent

- 5 Points More than 50% 4 Points - 40% to 49.9% 3 Points - 30% to 39.9% 2 Points - 20% to 29.9% 1 Point - 10% to 19.9%
- 9) Has any formal action or orders by a federal, state, or local governmental agency resulted in a partial or complete ban of the usage or expansion of the usage for the involved infrastructure? Examples include weight limits on structures, EPA orders to replace or repair sewerage, and moratoriums on building permits in a particular area due to local flooding downstream. POINTS CAN BE AWARDED ONLY IF CONSTRUCTION OF THE PROJECT BEING RATED WILL CAUSE THE BAN TO BE REMOVED.
  - 10 Points Complete ban
  - 5 Points Partial ban
  - O Points No ban
- 10) What is the total number of existing daily users that will benefit as a result of the proposed project? Appropriate criteria include traffic counts & households served, when converted to a measurement of persons. Public transit users are permitted to be counted for roads and bridges, but only when certifiable ridership figures are provided.
  - 10 Points 10,000 and Over
  - 8 Points 7,500 to 9,999
  - 6 Points 5,000 to 7,499
  - 4 Points 2,500 to 4,999
  - 2 Points 2,499 and Under
- 11) Does the infrastructure have REGIONAL impact? Consider originations & destinations of traffic, functional classification, size of service area, number of jurisdictions served, etc. (Functional classifications to be revised in
  - 5 Points Major impact (e.g., major multi-jurisdictional route, primary feed route to an Interstate, Federal-Aid Primary routes)

the future to conform to new Surface Transportation Act.)

- 4 Points -
- 3 Points Moderate impact (e.g., principal thoroughfares, Federal-Aid Urban routes)
- 2 Points -
- 1 Point Minimal or no impact (e.g., cul-de-sacs, subdivision streets)